

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 30, 31 and 36-39 were examined in the Non-Final Office Action dated 26 November 2008 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the examined claims were rejected.

5 By virtue of this response, claim 36 is sought to be amended. The amendment is believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendment is made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 30, 31 and 36-39 are thus presented for reconsideration further in view of the below remarks.

Election/Restrictions

10 Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the election of group I (claims 1, 4-6, 8, 30-31 and 36-39) in the reply filed on 02/25/2008. The Examiner is also thanked for examining the same.

It was further stated:

15 Regarding Applicant's request that amended withdrawn group II claims 11, 14-16, 18-20, and 32-33 be included into elected group I, the examiner states **that one cannot amend withdrawn claims.** (Page 2 paragraph 3 of Outstanding Office Action, **Emphasis Added**)

20 In response, Applicant quotes the pertinent parts of MPEP, which permit the Applicants to amend withdrawn claims:

25 (A) Status Identifiers: The current status of all of the claims in the application, including any previously canceled or withdrawn claims, must be given. Status is indicated in a parenthetical expression following the claim number by one of the following status identifiers: (original), (currently amended), (previously presented), (canceled), (withdrawn), (new), or (not entered). **The status identifier (withdrawn - currently amended) is also acceptable for a withdrawn claim that is being currently amended.** See paragraph (E) below for acceptable alternative status identifiers. (MPEP § 714, **Emphasis Added**)

30

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment to withdrawn claims and further resubmit the request to join the amended claims 14-16, 18-20 and 32-33 to elected group I.

5 *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102/103*

Claims 1, 4-6, 30-31 and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,089,286 issued to Malik (hereafter "Malik"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of US Publication No. 2005/0144309 naming as inventor Gish (hereafter "Gish").

10 Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the Outstanding Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse.

For example, previously presented claim 1 recites, "... wherein said determining checks a processing load on said database server and determines *not to send said data in said compressed format if the processing load* on said database server is determined to be *more than a first threshold.*" (*Emphasis Added*).

In other words, compression is not used when the processing load on the database server is high (more than a first threshold). As a result, the overload on the database server (to later decompress) is avoided by not using compression.

20 The Examiner is believed to rely on the below portion (among others) of Malik (see, page 6 lines - page 7 line 12 of the Outstanding Office Action):

25 The threshold according to which the system decides whether to compress a file can be automatically calculated, predetermined, or user-selected. An automatically calculated system changes the threshold point according to the relative amount of traffic on the network. The threshold point is used in step 43 of FIG. 4 for determining whether an attachment file is to be compressed. *For example, in the late evening, when a LAN for a business is generally underutilized, the threshold for compressing files can be set to be relatively large such that few files are compressed.* This allows for faster transmission because the system compresses comparatively fewer files before transmission. The recipient of the e-mail communication will

also have the benefit that fewer files need to be decompressed. In contrast, **during the peak hours on the network, the compression threshold is lowered, such that a majority of the attachment files are compressed before transmission along the network.** This reduces the number of packets sent along the network during busy time periods, thus allowing for more efficient usage. A detector connected to the network server (not shown in FIG. 3) detects the relative network traffic, and sends a signal regarding the traffic information to network interface 32 in FIG. 3. The detector determines the relative amount of traffic on the network by a number of known methods. This information is then provided to the e-mail attachment configuration module 33 from network interface 32. (Col. 5 lines 48 to Col. 6 line 6 of Malik, **Emphasis Added**)

Applicants first disagree with equating the claimed processing load on the database server, with the amount of traffic on the network. Such an equation would be unreasonable since a network (which provides connectivity) is not the same as a database system, as will be appreciated by one skilled in the relevant arts.

Even if such an analogy can be made, according to the teachings of Malik, compression is performed when traffic on the LAN is high (i.e., when the attachment size is greater than the compression threshold). In sharp contrast, as noted above, claim 1 recites that compression is **avoided** (i.e., not sent in compressed form) if the processing load is determined to be higher than a threshold. See also Col. 7 lines 25-35 of Malik.

For such a reason, the teachings associated with traffic quantity on network of Malik, would not teach or reasonably suggest the features of the present invention noted above.

The Examiner relies on the below portion of Malik also for the same feature:

Depending upon the configuration of the recipient's e-mail communications system, the sender's e-mail configurator module can include **additional capability to compress files according to the size limits imposed by the recipient's LAN.** In e-mail communication systems that are generally available in the prior art, a user will receive an "undeliverable mail" message in response to an e-mail, if the size of the group of attachments in the e-mail exceeds a predetermined size limit. The "undeliverable" message typically does indicate the size limit for the recipient's LAN. The present invention provides an automatic reconfiguration and resending of a mis-sent message in response to an "undeliverable message" that indicates the size limit for the recipient's LAN. The e-mail communications

5 system according to this embodiment additionally includes in the
e-mail configuration module 33 of FIG. 3 a detector for
detecting the receipt of a "undeliverable" notification. The
subject heading of the "undeliverable" notification provides the
size limit for the recipient's LAN. The sent e-mail is retrieved
and reconfigured according to steps 51 56 in FIG. 5. In this
application, the "E-Mail Size Limit Standards" is provided from
10 the subject heading of the "undeliverable" notification message.
This reconfiguration and resend feature can occur automatically,
or the user interface 31 in FIG. 3 may prompt the user to
authorize re-transmitting the e-mail communication. (Col. 7
lines 60 through Col. 8 line 17, **Emphasis Added**)

Again, Applicants first disagree with the Examiner equating the size limits imposed
by the recipient's LAN to the claimed processing load on the database server.

15 Furthermore, the LAN cannot be equated to the database server, and in addition, the
processing load and size limit are substantially different attributes. While size limit is
typically in terms of a count of bytes, processing load is a characteristic of usage of the
processor, as will be apparent to one skilled in the relevant arts. Equating the two is clearly
unreasonable.

20 At least for such reasons, previously presented claim 1 is allowable over the art of
record.

Claims 4-6,8, 30 and 31 depend from claim 1 and are thus allowable at least for the
reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

25 Dependent claim 31 is independently allowable in reciting two thresholds, which
should not be exceeded respectively by the database server and the database client, to
determine that the data is to be sent in compressed format. The Examiner maps the claim to
the same portions reproduced above, and there is no disclosure or suggestion in the mapped
portions of Malik for using **such two thresholds related to sender and receiver** respectively.

30 Currently amended independent claim 36 is allowable over the art of record in reciting
a database server and a second end system, which interface based on SQL. In sharp contrast,

the disclosure of Malik is related to email communications, which is a different form of interface (not based on SQL). Gish does not clearly cure that deficiency as being related to congestion control of packets at lower level in networks.

Claims 37-39 depend from claim 36 and are thus allowable at least for the reasons
5 noted above with respect to claim 36.

Conclusion

All the rejections and objections are thus believed to have been overcome. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if it is believed that an
10 interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416

Date: February 25, 2009